

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Michael Ladale Reeves,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	C/A No.: 6:15-cv-03666-GRA
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	(Written Opinion)
Jennifer Leigh Martin; Spartanburg)	
County Magistrate's Office; Media)	
General; Spartanburg County Sheriff's)	
Office; Greenville County Sheriff's)	
Office; Officer Jason Brown; SCENE –)	
TV 7; WSPA –TV 7; and WYCW – TV)	
62,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter comes before the Court for review of United States Magistrate Judge Kevin McDonald's Report and Recommendation made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) DSC, and filed on September 17, 2015. ECF No. 11. For the reasons discussed below, this Court adopts the Magistrate Judge's recommendation in its entirety.

Plaintiff Michael Ladale Reeves, proceeding *pro se*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. ECF No. 1. Magistrate Judge McDonald recommends that this Court dismiss Plaintiff's case against Defendants without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. ECF No. 11. The Magistrate Judge's recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). This Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions

of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and this Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

In order for objections to be considered by a United States District Judge, the objections must be timely filed and specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which the party objects and the basis for the objections. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 n.4 (4th Cir. 1984); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845–47 nn.1–3 (4th Cir. 1985). “Courts have . . . held *de novo* review to be unnecessary in . . . situations when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendation.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Furthermore, in the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198 (4th Cir. 1983). Plaintiff filed timely objections to the Report and Recommendation on September 30, 2015. ECF No. 13.

Having reviewed Plaintiff’s objections, this Court finds that the objections are unrelated to the dispositive portions of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, and merely restate Plaintiff’s original claims. Further, after a thorough review of the record, this Court concludes that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation accurately summarizes the case and the applicable law. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is accepted and adopted in its entirety.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this case is DISMISSED without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "G. Ross Anderson, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

G. Ross Anderson, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

October 7, 2015
Anderson, South Carolina